on the statement or regarding the contents of the statement. Rather than start another aspect of the bill when my time is just about out, I will turn on my light again.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Mr. Clerk, I understand there is an amendment on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler would move to amend. Senator, I have AM0133 in front of me. (AM0133 appears on pages 525-26 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Beutler. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, basically I support this bill. I think this bill needs more focus though and I wanted to suggest some amendments. I haven't discussed them with any of the parties, whether they favor the bill or do not favor the bill, that have taken an interest in bill so far. But there is just something that strikes me as inherently wrong in a situation where you give a company money to create jobs and they go off to Texas or someplace and don't even fill the jobs with Nebraskans, and then they treat people the way they do, and I think that the situation ought to be addressed. I think Senator Chambers' bill is too broad for liking right now, but I'm hoping that maybe through discussions today we can focus it a little bit more and do The first amendment that I have something that makes sense. that is before you deals with Section 2 of the bill. look at Section 2 of the bill, this is the one that says if 10 percent of the employees of the employer are non-English speaking, et cetera, the employer has to do two things. He has to (1) provide an interpreter and (2) provide a liaison person these people that are being hired and community What the amendment does is to simply limit the services. application of that section, not only to those that are more than 10 percent non-English speaking, but also limits it to employers who have gone actively recruiting more than 500 miles away to bring these people in. In other words, to me, to say that a company has to hire somebody as a liaison to community agencies might be a little bit much to be asking all employers regardless of how they had acquired their employees, but it doesn't seem to me to be too much to ask of an employer who has intentionally gone to other states to hire non-English speaking people to come into the state and, basically, essentially is importing poverty into the state. Now, by golly,